

BEFORE THE
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION) DOCKET NO.
On Its Own Motion) 02-0171
-vs-)
UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY)
Reconciliation of revenues collected)
under Coal Tar riders with prudent costs)
associated with coal tar clean up)
expenditures.)

Springfield, Illinois
October 10, 2002

Met, pursuant to notice, at 11:00 A.M.

BEFORE:

MR. LARRY JONES, Administrative Law Judge

APPEARANCES:

MS. SUSAN B. KNOWLES
1901 Chouteau Avenue
P.O. Box 66149
St. Louis, Missouri 63166

(Appearing on behalf of Ameren Services
Company via teleconference)

SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by
Carla J. Boehl, Reporter
Ln. #084-002710

1 APPEARANCES: (Cont'd)

2 MR. STEVEN MATRISCH
3 527 East Capitol Avenue
4 Springfield, Illinois 62794

5 (Appearing on behalf of the Staff of the
6 Illinois Commerce Commission)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I N D E XWITNESSES DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS

LESLIE PUGH
 By Mr. Matrisch 21

I N D E XEXHIBITS MARKED ADMITTED

UE Exhibit 1	e-docket	20
UE Exhibit 2, 2.1, 2.2,		
2.3	e-docket	20
UE Exhibit 3.0	e-docket	20
UE Exhibit 4	15	20
ICC Staff 1.00	e-docket	23

PROCEEDINGS

(Whereupon UE Exhibit 4
was marked for purposes
of identification as of
this date.)

JUDGE JONES: On the record. I next call for
hearing Docket 02-0171, Union Electric Company,
reconciliation of revenues collected under coal tar
riders with costs associated with coal tar clean-up
expenditures. This proceeding pertains to the 2001
reconciliation year. Status hearings in this matter
have been held in prior dates.

At this time may we have the appearances
orally for the record, first on behalf of the
Company.

MS. KNOWLES: Susan Knowles, Ameren Services
Company, representing AmerenUE, Union Electric
Company, business address One Ameren Plaza, 1901
Chouteau Avenue, P.O. Box 66149, Mail Code 1310, St.
Louis, Missouri 63166.

MR. MATRISCH: Appearing on behalf of the Staff
of the Illinois Commerce Commission, Steve Matrisch,

1 527 East Capitol Avenue, Springfield, Illinois
2 62701.

3 JUDGE JONES: Thank you. Are there any other
4 appearances? Let the record show there are not.

5 It is my understanding the Company is ready
6 to proceed. Ms. Knowles, is it correct that the
7 Company made pre-filings of what has been referred
8 to in the e-docket description as testimony and
9 rebuttal testimony of UE on April 29 and October 1?

10 MS. KNOWLES: That is correct.

11 JUDGE JONES: And are those the documents that
12 UE intends to offer into the record today?

13 MS. KNOWLES: That is correct, Your Honor.

14 JUDGE JONES: In addition, a set of publication
15 certificates identified by UE as UE Exhibit 4 will
16 be offered also, is that right?

17 MS. KNOWLES: That is correct.

18 JUDGE JONES: And the Exhibit 4 set of
19 publication certificates was filed in hard copy
20 only, is that correct?

21 MS. KNOWLES: That is correct.

22 JUDGE JONES: All right. I am going to go

1 through this list of exhibits to be offered and
2 assign them exhibit numbers so that those exhibit
3 numbers can be matched up with the file numbers on
4 the e-docket system. As the parties are aware,
5 documents filed under the testimony description in
6 e-docket can be admitted into the evidentiary record
7 without hard copies being required as long as there
8 are no changes being made in those electronically
9 filed exhibits. Now, that all assumes the exhibits
10 are admissible in other respects. But in terms of
11 the e-docket process, that's how that works,
12 basically.

13 On April 29 there were five items, file
14 items, shown in their e-docket record of that
15 filing. Item Number 2 is called Leonard L. Mans.
16 It is the testimony of Mr. Mans and it includes an
17 affidavit. That will be marked for identification
18 as UE Exhibit Number 1.

19 Item Number 1 in that filing was logged in
20 as Donald L. Richardson, Exhibit 2. We will assign
21 that the identification number of UE Exhibit Number
22 2.

1 The next three items consist of responses
2 to certain of the DRs that were submitted by Staff
3 and responded to by the Company. Item 3 was logged
4 in as Answers to Data Requests in Support of
5 Testimony in ICC 02-0171 by Don Richardson for
6 AmerenUE. Item 4, Answers to DRs by Don Richardson
7 in ICC 02-0171 on Behalf of AmerenUE. Item Number
8 5, Answer to DR LAP-007 by Susan Knowles in Support
9 of Testimony in ICC 02-0171 on Behalf of AmerenUE.
10 In terms of exhibit identification of these last
11 three items, three, four and five, we will call Item
12 Number 3 UE Exhibit 2.1. We will call Item Number 4
13 UE Exhibit 2.2. We will call Item Number 5 UE
14 Exhibit 2.3.

15 Now, we will see if there are any
16 objections to any of these in a minute. But we will
17 go ahead and get the next set identified for the
18 record and get that over with. That would be the
19 October 1 filing. That consists of three files,
20 Items 1, 2 and 3. The general description is
21 Rebuttal Testimony of Union Electric Company. Item
22 Number 2 says Leonard A. Mans and that is the

1 rebuttal testimony of Leonard A. Mans. Item Number
2 1 as it appears on the e-docket system says
3 affidavit of Leonard A. Mans. Item Number 3 says
4 Schedules A and B. These all came in with the
5 so-called rebuttal testimony of Mr. Mans. For
6 exhibit identification purposes, file Items 1, 2 and
7 3 will all be considered part of UE Exhibit Number
8 3.0.

9 Lastly, on the non-e-docket filed exhibit,
10 UE Exhibit Number 4 is entitled Publication
11 Certificates.

12 Now, with respect to the electronically
13 filed exhibits, are there any questions or points of
14 clarification with regard to the identification or
15 content of any of these items?

16 MR. MATRISCH: Staff has none.

17 MS. KNOWLES: Not from the Company.

18 JUDGE JONES: Are there any objections to the
19 admission of any of those electronically filed
20 exhibits or to UE Exhibit Number 4?

21 MR. MATRISCH: Staff has none.

22 JUDGE JONES: Let the record show those

1 exhibits are admitted into the evidentiary record.
2 More specifically, the electronically filed ones
3 consist of UE Exhibits 1, 2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 3.0,
4 the hard copy exhibit is UE Exhibit Number 4.

5 (Whereupon UE Exhibits
6 1, 2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.0
7 and 4 were admitted into
8 evidence.)

9 Does Staff have any questions for either of
10 those UE witnesses in this docket?

11 MR. MATRISCH: We do not, Your Honor.

12 JUDGE JONES: All right. I think that brings
13 us to the Staff case. It appears from the e-docket
14 system that prefiled testimony was electronically
15 submitted on September 5, 2002. Item 1 is entered
16 in as ICC Staff Exhibit 1.00, Leslie Pugh. Now, is
17 it correct, Mr. Matrisch, that there was no
18 affidavit with that?

19 MR. MATRISCH: That is correct, Your Honor.

20 JUDGE JONES: The witness is here and will be
21 identifying that testimony at this time, is that
22 right?

1 MR. MATRISCH: That is correct.

2 JUDGE JONES: Please stand and be sworn.

3 (Whereupon the Witness was duly sworn
4 by Judge Jones.)

5 **LESLIE PUGH**

6 called as a Witness on behalf of Staff of the
7 Illinois Commerce Commission, having been first duly
8 sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

9 DIRECT EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. MATRISCH:

11 Q. Would you please state your name for the
12 record.

13 A. Leslie Pugh.

14 Q. Who is your employer and what is your business
15 address, please?

16 A. The Illinois Commerce Commission, 527 East
17 Capitol Avenue, Springfield, Illinois 62701.

18 Q. And what is your position at the Illinois
19 Commerce Commission?

20 A. I am an accountant in the Accounting Department
21 of the Financial Analysis Division.

22 Q. You have before you a document that has been

1 previously marked for identification as ICC Staff
2 Exhibit 1.00 which consists of a cover page, a table
3 of contents and ten pages of narrative testimony and
4 it is entitled the Direct Testimony of Leslie Pugh.

5 Do you recognize this document?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Did you prepare this document?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Also attached to ICC Staff Exhibit 1.0 are
10 Schedules 1.01 and 1.02. Did you prepare these
11 schedules as well?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Did you have any additions or corrections to
14 make to either Staff Exhibit 1.00 or the attached
15 schedules?

16 A. No.

17 Q. And is the information contained in ICC Staff
18 Exhibit 1.00 and the attached schedules true and
19 correct to the best of your knowledge?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. If I were to ask you the same questions today
22 and for the same information as set forth in Staff

1 Exhibit 1.00 and the attached schedule, would your
2 responses be the same?

3 A. Yes.

4 MR. MATRISCH: Your Honor, at this time I move
5 for admission into evidence ICC Staff Exhibit 1.00
6 and attached schedules, 1.01 and 1.02.

7 JUDGE JONES: Thank you. Any objection to
8 that?

9 MS. KNOWLES: The Company has no objection.

10 JUDGE JONES: Let the record show ICC Staff
11 Exhibit 1.00 is hereby entered into the evidentiary
12 record as filed electronically on September 5, 2002.
13 The exhibit as admitted includes the schedules that
14 were attached to it when it was filed
15 electronically. Thank you.

16 (Whereupon ICC Staff
17 Exhibit 1.00 was
18 admitted into evidence.)

19 Lastly, it is my understanding the parties
20 are agreeable to a schedule calling for the
21 submission of a suggested order by the Company on
22 December 2. That will be the filed electronically.

1 A copy of that should be provided to me
2 electronically in Word format. There are some steps
3 which precede that filing. I will not read them
4 into the record at this time. However, if any party
5 wants those prior steps read into the record, we
6 will do that.

7 Is there any objection to use of that
8 schedule?

9 MR. MATRISCH: None from Staff, Your Honor.

10 JUDGE JONES: Let the record show that that
11 filing schedule for the post-hearing filing of a
12 suggested order is hereby put into the evidentiary
13 record.

14 Off the record just briefly regarding the
15 rules and procedures regarding e-docket exhibits.

16 (Whereupon there was
17 then had an
18 off-the-record
19 discussion.)

20 JUDGE JONES: Back on the record. Let the
21 record showed there was a short off-the-record
22 discussion for the purposes indicated. I believe

1 there is nothing else to take up on the record
2 today. At this time subject to the post-hearing
3 schedule just put into place, this matter is hereby
4 marked heard and taken. Thank you, all.

5 HEARD AND TAKEN